

Mister Speaker, we spend a lot of our time these days talking about costs.

Costs of regulation, costs of repeal, costs of implementation. Conveniently missing from this discussion are the human costs – lives lost, and altered by heart attacks, asthma and brain damage – due to fine particulate matter in our air and mercury in our water.

My hometown of Chicago knows this all too well. Chicago ranks second among all cities in the country adversely affected by power plant pollution. Power plant emissions are responsible for 855 premature deaths, 848 hospitalizations, 1,519 heart attacks, and 23,650 asthma attacks every single year.

Two particularly egregious emitters, the Fisk and Crawford power plants, emit fine particulate matter that directly contribute to 41 deaths, 550 ER visits and 2,800 asthma attacks annually. EPA estimates that fine particle pollution from power plants shortens the lives of 1,356 people from my home state each year. Talk about costs.

Funny enough, we're standing here debating the merits of a bill that says to Fisk and Crawford in Chicago, "forget about reducing your emissions that contribute to ozone and particulate pollution." In 2001, the Harvard School of Public Health put out an Illinois Power Plant Study. In the 8 years since these harms were modeled and publicized, says the Environmental Law and Policy Center, the continued Fisk and Crawford coal plant pollution has caused from 750 million to 1 billion dollars in health and environmental related damages. Even if you don't care about global warming, you don't believe climate change is man-made, you can't argue with these numbers.

So, if you want to talk costs, let's talk costs.

Fisk and Crawford power plants cost Chicagoans 41 lives per year.

Fisk and Crawford power plants cost Chicagoans 550 ER visits per year.

Fisk and Crawford power plants cost Chicagoans 2,800 asthma attacks per year.

And, Fisk and Crawford power plants cost Chicagoans from 750 million to **1 billion dollars** in only 8 of the 50 plus years we've been collecting data on their pollutants.

The answer to these **costs** is not to repeal the law that clean our air, that protects our children and that allows us to remain competitive in a global market. The answer is to transition away from the antiquated and outdated industry that pollutes, and toward green infrastructure that encourages domestic economic development.

I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 910, the Dirty Air Act.